# CAMPMASTER

## Development of European Curriculum in the Field of Sustainable Camping Resort Management

### 2020-1-HR01-KA203-077806

### ID2 – EVALUATION AND QUALITY PLAN (INTERNAL DELIVERABLE)

| Document information | |
|---|---|
| Title of Deliverable | Evaluation and Quality Plan |
| Date of Delivery | 29/03/2021 |
| Final version date | 29/3/2021 |
| Author(s) | Ariadna Gassiot and Lluís Coromina (UdG) |
| Contributor(s) | FTHM, BUAS, LEADING, KUH, CAG, RECRON. |
| Reviewer(s) | UdG (Blasco Franch, Majo Fernamdez, Prats Planaguma, Camprubi Subirana, Aulet Serrallonga) |
| Approved by | All partners |

| Version | Name/Partner | Date | Change Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| v.1 | FTHM Tajana Brajković | 22/01/2021 | First Draft |
| Final version date | UdG Ariadna Gassiot and Lluís Coromina | 29/03/2021 | Final Version |

## Table of Contents

## Index of tables

# 1. Introduction

This evaluation and Quality Plan will be a working document which will include the agreed quality system (quality criteria, methods, techniques, tools), and will describe the implementation (processes and procedures, timetables) of activities aimed at ensuring quality control of outputs and quality assurance of processes.

The document is composed by 6 main sections after this introduction as follows:

- Section 2 gives an overview of the quality management approach. It includes the definitions and concepts about quality assurance and control, the main indicators used to evaluate quality, and the definition of roles and responsibilities.

- Section 3 defines the quality plan purposes, which are classified into: summative, operational, learning and excellence purposes.

- Section 4 includes a general overview of quality control deadlines. Here, the main deliverables, meetings and internal deliverables are listed together with their deadlines. The main project processes and quality assurance is also described.

- Section 5 includes the specific overview of project activities and deliverables. These specific and partial activities and deliverables will also be part of the evaluation.

- Section 6 includes the description of the main tools and methods used for both quality control and assurance.

- Section 7 are the appendix materials, including: the general quality register matrix, the partners survey, the general outputs quality matrix, and matrices to evaluate the internal meetings, the final conference, the learning week, the multiplier events and the learning platform.

## 2. Quality management approach

The purpose for managing quality is to validate that the project deliverables are completed with an acceptable level of quality and that the processes follow the estimated steps. In other words, quality management assures the quality of the project deliverables and the quality of the processes used to manage and create the deliverables. Table 1 summarizes differences between quality control and assurance:

Table 1: Quality Control and Quality Assurance.

| | **Quality Control (QC)** | **Quality Assurance (QA)** |
|---|---|---|
| **DEFINITION** | QC is a set of activities for ensuring quality in products.<br><br>The activities focus on identifying weaknesses/mistakes in the actual outputs produced. | QA is a set of activities for ensuring quality in the processes by which outputs are developed. |
| **FOCUS ON** | QC aims to identify (and correct) weaknesses or mistakes in the finished product. Quality control, therefore, is a reactive process. | QA aims to prevent defects with a focus on the process used to make the output. It is a proactive quality process. |
| **GOAL** | The goal of QC is to identify weaknesses/mistakes after an output is developed and before it's released. | The goal of QA is to improve development and test processes so that weaknesses do not arise when the output is being developed. |
| **RESPONSIBILITY** | Quality control is usually the responsibility of a specific reviewer who checks the output on the basis of a given set of standards. | Everyone on the team involved in developing the product is responsible for quality assurance. |

This document will define both quality control and quality assurance processes and tools. Quality and achievement of project activities will be defined with the following aspects in mind:

- **Summative evaluation**, aimed at ensuring efficiency of the project (respect of deadlines, control of expenditures): to this respect, a logical framework matrix will be used as reference document for monitoring.

- **Quality assurance (including formative evaluation):** aimed at ensuring quality of processes and effectiveness of the project: to this respect, questionnaires, internal and external to the consortium members, semi-structured interviews, and templates for feedback collection will be developed and used.
- **Quality control (quality of the outputs):** the criteria for quality control, aside of general standards to written documents, will be developed by the partnership during the preparation phase, by also consulting key informants representing the target groups. As regards tools, templates for peer review, matrixes for external quality assessment will be used. Some quality assurance tool, e.g. templates for collecting feedbacks during the events, will include also assessment of the event organization (in addition to discussed topics, or satisfaction of users for the meaning of the event, etc.).

In order to ensure all these processes, some general indicators were defined in the proposal (Table 2). However, some more will be added in this document as they will be specific for each process and each deliverable:

Table 2: General list of indicators.

| Qualitative indicators | Quantitative indicators |
| --- | --- |
| Active participation of stakeholders from camping industry at events | Number of participants in IO1 |
| Level of involvement of higher education students | Number of participants in Multiplier events |
| Relevance of feedback collected in terms of design of joint initiatives including students | Number of learning outcomes drafted |
| Level of understanding and proactivity of stakeholders with regard to camping industry | Number of course syllabi produced |
| Relevance of feedback collected in terms of contribution to learning design and development | Number of participants in online learning events |
| Quality, usability and coherence of the learning platform with respect to the expected objective | Number of teachers trained in the "Learning week" |
| Relevance of learning resources and case studies developed in the frame of the project | Number of teaching staff participating in different activities |
| Raised awareness and interest about sustainable camping management | |

There is a combination of both qualitative and quantitative indicators as they provide a different view on how processes are finished and completed and on how deliverable meet a series of standards.

In general, quality measures will be applied to both deliverables and processes. The general quality standards of project deliverables include elements such as completeness, consistency, readiness, language appropriateness, etc. The general measures to evaluate project processes aim at ensuring the planned steps are followed and the expectations of different stakeholders are followed, so the expectations are met. Methods and tools followed to evaluate project deliverables and processes will be different according to each process or product and will be later defined. However, they define how these processes are ensured. The quality management plan identifies the following key components:

Table 3: Quality general measures and methods.

| OBJECTS OF QUALITY REVIEW | QUALITY MEASURES | QUALITY EVALUATION METHODS |
|---|---|---|
| Project Deliverables | **Deliverable Quality Standards**<br>"measures" used to determine a quality compliant output; these are defined by the consortium, and are usually at least:<br>• Completeness<br>• Consistency with the planned work and expected outcome<br>• Readiness<br>• Language appropriateness<br>*Additional quality standards can be related to specific features of the output.* | **Quality Control Activities**<br>monitor and verify that the project outputs meet defined quality standards |
| Project Processes | **Process Quality Standards**<br>"measures" used to determine if project work processes are being followed<br><br>**Stakeholder Expectations**<br>describe when a project process is effective as defined by the project stakeholders | **Quality Assurance Activities**<br>monitor and verify that the processes used to manage and create the outputs are followed and are effective |

## 2.1. Roles and responsibilities

The processes of quality assurance and control need to be consciously planned and implemented. Roles and responsibilities, in turn, need to be defined and communicated to the main partners or stakeholders. Thus, team members have different roles and responsibilities in the different tasks included throughout the project. In spite of the definition of responsible members for the different tasks linked to quality assurance and control, all member institutions and their staff need to be informed about both internal and externals processes followed to ensure quality in project deliverables and processes. In other words, each partner

may have a role of responsible, accountant, consulted or informed actor in each quality process but at least all of them must be communicated and informed. The following table identifies the quality-related responsibilities of the project team:

Table 4: Roles and responsibilities.

| Project Team Role | QC and QA Responsibilities |
|---|---|
| Project Manager | - To coordinate QA activities<br>- To collect data from partners' survey in the frame of Monitoring and Evaluation activities<br>- To keep updated project partners on the outcomes of QA activities<br>- To held meetings with partners on purpose, in case of risks |
| Partner responsible for project quality | - To deliver methods, tools and timing of quality and formative evaluation activities;<br>- To send and collect data from internal evaluation (partner' survey)<br>- To send templates and collect data from external evaluation (events)<br>- To recall partners' review tasks for specific activities, receive from them results<br>- To appoint reviewers to the tasks<br>- To ensure tools to be used in appropriate ways and timing;<br>- To keep updated quality register;<br>- To collect and systematize quality matrix. |
| Partner leading the IO | - To contribute to QA activities overall, and particularly keeping under control processes within appointed IO;<br>- To ensure outputs to be reviewed in time (QC) |
| Partners | - Agreeing in written with proposed methodologies and tools;<br>- To contribute to QA activities overall;<br>- To provide quality control when required, by using appropriate tools;<br>- To provide QA (stakeholders expectations) when required and by using appropriate tools.<br>- To collect evaluation data consistently within the frame of Monitoring and Evaluation<br>- To discuss and review intermediate results during the meetings and/or when required. |

As seen in the previous table, depending on each project deliverable and process, the tasks will be different. These general quality tasks and responsibilities ensure coordination in the steps followed and consistency in deliverables format, characteristics, quality standards, etc.

## 3. Quality plan purposes

The definition of a quality plan in a project has different purposes. For the CAMPMASTER project, these purposes are: summative purposes, operational purposes, learning purposes and quality/excellence purposes.

### 3.1. Summative purposes

Summative purposes define principles and criteria of quality, both for internal (within the consortium) and external (impact of the project on camping industry) processes, outputs and outcomes. These purposes have to do with the concept of efficiency.

### 3.2. Operational purposes

Operational purposes include the process to design and develop tools to be used for quality assurance. It has to do with the concept of effectiveness and it deals with the following aspects:

- Outputs meet the requirements established by the consortium (quality control).
- Processes that lead to outputs production and delivery support improved performance of the project (quality assurance and learning evaluation, as formative evaluation of the consortium to improve continuously processes).

In conclusion, all the outputs and processes of the project will be evaluated with this type of purposes in mind.

### 3.3. Learning purposes

These may be defined as formative purposes and can be both internal (i.e. within the consortium) and external (i.e. consulting stakeholders and other users and asking for feedback).

### 3.4. Quality and excellence purposes

This part of quality assurance and control deals with the external quality review and evaluation when needed. Both processes and products must meet these standards of quality and excellence, so this is why this document deals with this type of purposes, too.

## 4. General Overview of Quality Control and Assurance and deadlines

First, quality control deals with project deliverables. So, as a general overview, it is important list the main project deliverables and products that will be assessed and consider their deadlines in the timeline of the project. First, the following intellectual outputs, together with their specific parts and peculiarities will be assessed:

Table 5: Main intellectual outputs and deadlines.

| ID | Project Deliverable Name | Deadline Month |
|---|---|---|
| I01 | Learning outcomes and modules of the study program Sustainable camping resort management | M7 |
| IO2 | CAMPMASTER Curriculum Handbook | M17 |
| IO3 | Learning platform for camping industry | M17 |
| IO4 | Teaching case studies from the camping industry | M24 |

In order to ensure a smooth sequence of tasks, each Intellectual Outcome has a leader institution who will be responsible for its completion and good coordination: for IO1, UdG; for IO2, BUAS; for IO3, UNIRI FTHM; and for IO4, LEADING with the help of KUH and CAG.
Other general milestones that will be assessed and controlled that are part of the previous general Intellectual Outputs are:

Table 6: Other deliverables and deadlines.

| ID | Project Other Deliverable Name | Deadline Month |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Logo, graphics and website (project identity) | M7 |
| 2 | Learning week | M7 |
| 3 | Survey of stakeholders on skills gaps | M7 |
| 4 | Three multiplier events | M7 |
| 5 | Six learning resources | M24 |
| 6 | Final conference (4th multiplier event) | M24 |

In addition, there are some internal documents that will be assessed and evaluated. These documents aim at facilitating the implementation of the project processes and tasks:

Table 7: Main internal deliverables and deadlines.

| ID | Project Internal Deliverable Name | Deadline Month |
|---|---|---|
| ID1 | CAMPMASTER Implementation Manual | M7 |
| ID2 | Evaluation and Quality Plan | M7 |
| ID3 | Dissemination and exploitation Plan | M7 |

As it happens with Intellectual Outputs, these Internal Deliverables have also a responsible institution and leader who controls its completion: for ID1, FTHM; for ID2, UdG; and for ID3, LEADING with KUH and CAG. Second, quality assurance deals with project processes. Part of these actions and processes are the meetings organized. There will be internal coordination through meetings and committees.

The general ones to be considered in the project are:

Table 8: Main meetings and deadlines.

| ID | Project Meeting Name | Deadline Month |
|----|----------------------|----------------|
| M1 | Kick-off meeting Opatija, Croatia (UNIRI FTHM premises) | M1 |
| M2 | Coordination Meeting 2, Breda, Netherlands (BUAS premises) | M7 |
| M3 | Coordination Meeting 3, Germany (LEADING premises) | M17 |
| M4 | Final Coordination Meeting, Girona, Spain (UdG premises) | M24 |

These meetings have an internal organization process and there are some responsibilities defined. UNIRI FTHM will be in charge of sending the agenda, logistics, chairing the meeting, providing minutes and uploading the minutes on the shared repository. Hosting partners will be in charge for providing information about accommodation and directions to get to the location, supporting booking processes, providing catering, providing equipment and rooms needed, and providing feedback on the proposed agenda and, in general, participating in the actions.

These are the general deadlines established and estimated in the proposal. As it will be specified in the risk management plan, these deadlines are more or less flexible according to the different situations that may exist.

Finally, quality assurance mainly deals with the following project processes (Table 9). The quality standards, stakeholders' expectations, quality assurance activity and frequency are defined:

Table 9: Project processes and quality assurance.

| Project Process | Process Quality Standards | Stakeholders Expectation | Quality Assurance Activity | Frequency |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Partners communication | All partners participated the survey Partners rate satisfaction about communication items above average | N/A | Partners' survey | After meetings Each six months |
| Respect of internal deadlines | Intermediate and final outputs delivered as agreed | N/A | Monitoring | According to the work plan |
| Dissemination of project concept | Agreement on the message All partners can provide evidence of dissemination | Information on project concept | Monitoring | According to dissemination plan |
| Events | Active participation of attendants promoted | Active participation Feedbacks taken into consideration | Feedback collection | During the events |
| Internal Consortium Meetings | Active participation of attendants promoted | N/A | Partners' feedback collection | After the meetings |
| Project website | | Usability and meeting stakeholders' interest in addressed topics | Checking analytics Feedback collection | During the project implementation, according to dissemination plan |

## 5. Specific Overview of Output Activities and Deliverables

### 5.1. Output 1

This output includes the following activities and deliverables. These activities and deliverables will be assessed according to the methods and using different tools. First, the general structure of this O1 is as follows:

Table 10: O1 activities and deliverables.

| ID | Activity Name | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|
| O1.A1 | To agree on the overall methodology to be adopted during the curriculum development and prepare Implementation CAMPMASTER Guidelines. | Implementation CAMPMASTER guidelines |
| O1.A2 | To analyze the best international master tourism and hospitality graduate study programs and their learning outcomes. | Analysis of the learning outcomes of the best tourism master programs |
| O1.A3 | CAMPMASTER learning needs design: to design processes of identification of learning gaps and to establish mechanisms to answer learning needs with tailored, on-demand learning opportunities. Creating the questionnaire for students and a camping industry professionals survey about learning needs, skills gaps and expected graduate competences. | Manual with semi-structured questionnaire |
| O1.A4 | O1.A4. CAMPMASTER learning needs research and analysis: to conduct the survey among a minimum of 100 camping industry professionals, 60 students and 10 policy makers. Survey analysis and interpretation of results. | 3 Survey analyses (each university performs the semi-structured inquiry) |
| O1.A5 | O1.A5. Preparation of the first draft of the learning outcomes document, based on the survey results. | Draft with learning outcomes. |
| O1.A6 | O1.A6 CAMPMASTER focus groups for the discussion on the learning outcomes. | the manual How to run focus group workshops 3 workshop reports (E1-E3) with analysis of achieved results |
| O1.A7 | O1.A7. to define the final version of learning outcomes of study program and according to learning outcomes define the main modules of the study program and goals. | Definition of study program goals, min 15 learning outcomes as a basis for CAMPMASTER a list of modules for the CAMPMASTER study program. |

### 5.2. Output 2

This output includes the following activities and deliverables. These activities and deliverables will be assessed according to the methods and using different tools. First, the general structure of this O2 is as follows:

With the support of the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Table 11: O2 activities and deliverables.

| ID | Activity Name | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|
| O2.A1 | To establish courses and teaching staff that each university will be responsible for, in accordance with IO1 (intended master program learning outcomes and defined modules). | Manual on how to draft a syllabus with description of all elements |
| O2.A2 | To define a minimum of 15 syllabus courses with main elements: university teacher, course learning outcomes, content, competences (generic and specific), teaching hours, ECTS, teaching and assessment methods, quality control methods, literature list. | Complete curriculum with a minimum 15 course syllabi |
| O2.A3 | To establish common methodology for curriculum implementation and develop guidelines for the work placement, instructions for of the mentoring for mentors and final thesis rules and procedures. | Guidelines for work placement, mentoring and final thesis |
| O2.A4 | To produce the final version of a complete set of 15 syllabi and to conduct the constructive alignment between assessment and learning outcomes at the course level and intended program learning outcomes level. | |
| O2.A5 | To review the complete curriculum by two anonymous reviewers from European universities and camping association partners. | 2 reviews of the curriculum |
| O2.A6 | to produce the revised CAMPMASTER curriculum with reviewer's comments considered. | |
| C1 | To train university teachers in order to enhance teaching competencies and implement the process of learning community in the new study program. | |

## 5.3. Output 3

This output includes the following activities and deliverables. These activities and deliverables will be assessed according to the methods and using different tools. First, the general structure of this O3 is as follows:

Table 12: O3 activities and deliverables.

| ID | Activity Name | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|
| O3.A1 | To set up the virtual environment for online activities. | 1 technical design of on-line learning platform |
| O3.A2 | Design and development of learning resources | 6 learning resources |
| O3.A3 | Organization of learning events, collecting feedback from users and analyzing it. | 6 online Learning events with evaluation reports |
| O3.A4 | Revised learning resources according to evaluation data will be published as final OERs | |

## 5.4. Output 4

This output includes the following activities and deliverables. These activities and deliverables will be assessed according to the methods and using different tools. First, the general structure of this O4 is as follows:

Table 13: O4 activities and deliverables.

| ID | Activity Name | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|
| O4.A1 | Guidelines development: partner universities develop guidelines for drafting a teaching case study. | Guidelines for case studies. |
| O4.A2 | Identification of best practices: camping associations select and identify campsites in Europe that will be used as best practice examples | Document with best practices |
| O4.A3 | Observation process: collecting data, procedures, experiences, manager's opinions, attitudes, videos, photos from the campsites for the purpose of creating the case studies. Doing interviewing and questioning. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Categorization, classification, storage and retrieval of data. | |
| **O4.A4** | Produce 12 teaching case studies | 12 teaching case studies |

## 6. Quality assurance and control tools and methods

A general list of tools and methods used for both quality control and assurance will be provided here and can be seen in the quality register to complete during the project too (Appendix I). The following table lists the standards, quality activities and frequency and deadlines to support quality management implementation for the main outcomes of the project:

Table 14: General methods for quality control and assurance of outputs.

| Project Output | Specific Quality Standards | Quality Control Activity | Frequency/Deadline |
|---|---|---|---|
| **O1**<br>**LEARNING OUTCOMES AND MODULES OF THE MASTER STUDY PROGRAMME SUSTAINABLE CAMPING RESORT MANAGEMENT** | - Appropriateness of research approach;<br>- Easiness of use for research implementation<br>- Descriptive and learning purposes adequately covered | Peer review | By 15 days after the analysis of learning needs and skills gaps via students and stakeholder survey delivery |
| **O2**<br>**CAMPMASTER CURRICULUM HANDBOOK** | - Appropriateness of research approach;<br>- Easiness of use for research implementation<br>- Descriptive and learning purposes adequately covered<br>- Easiness of use<br>- Usability | Peer review<br>External feedback (sample of users) | By 30 days after the output final draft delivery |
| **O3**<br>**LEARNING PLATFORM FOR CAMPING INDUSTRY** | - Easiness of use<br>- Usability | Peer review | By 30 days after the final platform delivery. |
| **O4**<br>**TEACHING CASE STUDIES FROM THE CAMPING INDUSTRY** | - Active participation<br>- Learning approach respected | Peer review on reports Feedback collection sheets from participants | By 30 days after the evaluation and data analysis, cross-checks of facts delivery |

A general list of the tools used for both quality control and quality assurance is as follows:

Table 15: General list of quality tools and purposes.

| Tool Name | Tool Purpose/Use |
|---|---|
| Quality register | Document that lists quality activities carried out – updated during the project implementation by the responsible partner. |
| Partners survey for processes | Collecting data for monitoring project processes. |
| Outcome Quality Matrix | Template to be filled by appointed reviewer(s) (partners peer review) for quality control of each deliverable (O1, O2, O3, O4).<br>Template to be filled by appointed external reviewer(s) for quality control of deliverable (O4). |
| Quality assurance matrix for internal consortium meetings | Template to be filled by the participants to these meetings. |
| Quality assurance matrix for final conference | Template to be filled by participants to this event. |
| Quality assurance matrix for | Template to be filled by participants to this event. |

| | |
|---|---|
| the learning week | |
| Quality assurance matrix for multiplier events | Template to be filled by participant to events. |
| Peer and external review of the Learning Platform | Template that collects feedbacks of final beneficiaries and peers. |
| Project's added value summary | Template to be filled by the project partners and other stakeholders. |

First, the quality register is a document to follow all the quality processes of the project. Second, the partners survey will be used for all the processes to be developed in the project. Each partner will complete one for each of the four main parts of the project (O1, O2, O3 and O4). Third, the outcome quality matrix will be used and filled by partners for each main output (O1, O2, O3 and O4) and, for O4, this will be filled by other external reviewers, too. Then, different quality assurance matrices are given for completion by participants in: internal consortium meetings, the final conference, the learning week, multiplier events and the learning platform. The final document is a summary of the project added value that will be fulfilled in the 23$^{rd}$ month of the project.

After this description, first, the main tools for quality control of the main intellectual outputs are given with reference to the appendix where these are developed:

Table 16: Tools for main intellectual outputs.

| ID | Deliverable Short Name | Quality control tool | Appendix |
|---|---|---|---|
| **I01** | Learning outcomes and modules of the study program Sustainable camping resort management | Output Quality Matrix | III |
| **IO2** | CAMPMASTER Curriculum Handbook | | |
| **IO3** | Learning platform for camping industry | | |
| **IO4** | Teaching case studies from the camping industry | | |
| **M1** | Kick-off meeting Opatija, Croatia (UNIRI FTHM premises) | Quality assurance matrix for internal consortium meetings | IV |
| **M2** | Coordination Meeting 2, Breda, Netherlands (BUAS premises) | | |
| **M3** | Coordination Meeting 3, Germany (LEADING premises) | | |
| **M4** | Final Coordination Meeting, Girona, Spain (UdG premises) | | |
| **M4.1** | Final Conference | Quality assurance matrix for final conference | V |
| **C1** | Learning week | Quality assurance matrix for the learning week | VI |
| **O1.A6** | Multiplier events | Quality assurance matrix for the multiplier events | VII |
| **O3** | Learning Platform | Quality assurance matrix for the learning platform | VIII |

## Appendix

### I. Quality register

| Item | QA/QC | Quality method | Reviewer/Responsible | Date review | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| O1 - LEARNING OUTCOMES | QC | Peer review | | | |
| O2 - CURRICULUM | QC | Peer review<br>External feedback (sample of users) | | | |
| O2 - Curriculum Handbook (CCH) | QC | Peer review | | | |
| O3 - LEARNING PLATFORM | QC | Peer review<br>Feedback collection sheets from participants | | | |
| O4 - TEACHING CASE STUDIES | QC | Peer review on reports<br>Feedback collection sheets from participants | | | |
| C1 - Learning week - MEETING BREDA | QC | | | | |
| L1 – L6 Learning event | QC/QA | | | | |
| M1 – Kick off meeting | QC | Peer review on event reports | | | |
| M7 - Meeting 2, Breda, Netherlands | QC | Peer review<br>External review | | | |
| M17 - Meeting 3, Stuttgart, Germany | QC | Peer review | | | |
| M24 - Final Meeting 4, Girona, Spain | QC | | | | |
| E1-E3 Multiplier event | QC | Peer review on reports<br>Feedback collection sheets from participants | | | |
| E4 – final conference | QC | Peer review on reports<br>Feedback collection sheets from participants | | | |
| | QA | Analytics, other kind of feedbacks Feedback collection sheets from participants | | | |
| Partners communication | QA | Partners' survey | | | |
| Respect of internal deadlines | QA | Monitoring (logical framework matrix) | | | |
| Dissemination of project concept | QA | Monitoring (logical framework matrix) | | | |

## II. Partners survey

Partner, name and surname: _____

Date:                          _____

Period of evaluation:      _____

Please asses the following issues from 1 (very low) to 10 (very high), feel free to provide additional comments

| Key points:<br>**1. Project processes** | Rating 1-10 | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Keeping agreed deadlines and following procedures (e.g. work packages, administrative and financial matters) | | |
| 1.2 Promoting national and international cooperation between partners | | |
| 1.3 Leading/contributing to deliverables | | |
| 1.4 Dealing with any problems and difficulties | | |
| 1.5 Upholding fairness and diversity principles (cultural diversity among partners, fairness in the relationships among partners) | | |
| **2. Intellectual Outputs** | | |
| 2.1 Efficacy of working methods | | |
| 2.2 Efficiency of working methods | | |
| 2.3 Problems/difficulties that came up and solutions found | | |
| **3. Promotion, dissemination and exploitation of results** | | |
| 3.1 Implementing the dissemination strategy | | |
| 3.2 Effectiveness of the dissemination activities | | |
| 3.3 Creating synergies with relevant European and international projects (e.g. other Erasmus+ projects) | | |

## III.  Output Quality Matrix

| Quality Control Check | Y/N | Reviewer recommendations/comments |
|---|---|---|
| **Generic Minimum Quality Standards** | | |
| Document Summary/Introduction provided (with adequate synopsis of contents) | | |
| CAMPMASTER format standards complied with | | |
| Objectives of outputs as described in the project proposal covered | | |
| Expected work adequately covered | | |
| Quality of text is acceptable (organization and structure; diagrams; readability) | | |
| Comprehensiveness is acceptable (no missing sections; missing references; unexplained arguments) | | |
| Usability is acceptable (deliverable provides clear information in a form that is useful to the reader) | | |
| **Output specific quality criteria** | | |
| Output meets specific acceptance criteria | | |

**Checklist completed by**

Name/Partner: *PERSON_NAME, ORGANISATION_NAME*

Date: *DD/MM/YYYY*

Signature:

With the support of the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

IV. Quality assurance matrix for internal consortium meetings

**CAMPMASTER**
**Location:** <Organisation, Address, Country>
**Date:** <DD/MM/YY>

**Meeting evaluation matrix**

| *Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = strongly disagree (SD) and 5 = strongly agree (SA)* | SD | D | N | A | SA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Information and support for arranging practical issues (accommodation, travel, etc.) were provided | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The meeting purpose and objectives were clearly stated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Our meeting time was convenient for me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Our meeting place was convenient for me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| We shared decision-making at this meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| All meeting participants were actively involved | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| We used our meeting time effectively | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I am satisfied with this meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I enjoyed this meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The meeting met my expectations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| What aspects of this meeting were particularly good? | | | | | |
| What aspects of this meeting require improvement? | | | | | |
| Do you have any suggestions or additional comments about this meeting? | | | | | |

**Thank you!**

## V. Quality assurance matrix for the final conference

**CAMPMASTER E4 final conference**
**Location:** <Organization, Address, Country>
**Date:** <DD/MM/YY>

**FEEDBACK FORM**

*Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements using the following scale:*

| 1 | Strongly disagree | 3 | Neither agree/nor disagree | 5 | Strongly agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Disagree | 4 | Agree | | |

| Section A : Organisation of the conference | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.  Communications about the conference have been clear | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.  Communications about the conference have been timely | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. The conference printed materials were well prepared/relevant | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4.  The conference venue was appropriate/convenient | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5.  Catering arrangements were appropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. The registration process was handled smoothly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. The session times were appropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Section B : About the conference** | | | | | |
| 1. Most of the topics presented was interesting to me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The key-speakers were well selected and well prepared | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Adequate time was provided for Q&A during the sessions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. The conference covered the perspectives relevant to my work/professional life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I learnt a lot during the conference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. The conference is a right way to strengthen the relations with colleagues, with other stakeholders, it is good option for networking | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Section C : Overall** | | | | | |
| 1. Overall, the conference was worthwhile to attend | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.The CAMPMASTER project is useful for me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Please let us know your additional comments about the Conference**

| If you want to be involved on keep informed about the progression of the CAMPMASTER project, you can leave your e-mail address here | |
|---|---|

**Thank you!**

## VI. Quality Assurance Matrix for the Learning Week

**CAMPAMASTER – Learning week MEETING BREDA**
**Location:** <Organisation, Address, Country>
**Date:** <DD/MM/YY>

**FEEDBACK FORM**

| Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices | Not at all | A little | Average | Yes | A lot |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Did the event meet your expectations? | | | | | |
| Do you think you have learnt a lot during the event? | | | | | |
| Do you think you can easily use what you have learnt in organization of local events? | | | | | |
| **Please rate the quality of the following items** | **Very poor** | **Poor** | **Average** | **Good** | **Very good** |
| Materials delivered during the event | | | | | |
| The trainers conducting the workshops | | | | | |
| Methods/techniques used during the workshops | | | | | |
| Accompanying events (excursions, dinners; if participated) | | | | | |
| General organization of event (accommodation, venues, catering) | | | | | |
| **Please rate the following items with regard to present/future perceived usefulness in your** | **I am not** | **Not useful** | **Somewhat useful** | **Quite useful** | **Very useful** |
| The CAMPMASTER project overall | | | | | |
| The discussion during the workshops and meetings | | | | | |
| Sharing with colleagues, networking | | | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Is there anything you do want to add? (e.g. suggestions, general comments, etc.)** | |

**Thank you!**

## VII. Quality Assurance Matrix for the multiplier events

**E1/E2/E3/E4**
**Location:** <Organisation, Address, Country>
**Date:** <DD/MM/YY>

**FEEDBACK FORM**

| Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices | 1 Not at all | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 Completely |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Did the event meet your expectations? | | | | | |
| Do you think you have learnt a lot during the event? | | | | | |
| Do you think you can easily use what you have learnt in organization of local | | | | | |
| **Please rate the quality of the following items** | **1 Very poor** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 Very good** |
| Materials delivered during the event | | | | | |
| The trainers conducting the workshops | | | | | |
| Methods/techniques used during the workshops | | | | | |
| Accompanying events (excursions, dinners; if participated) | | | | | |
| General organization of event (accommodation, venues, catering) | | | | | |
| **Please rate the following items with regard to present/future perceived** | **1 Not useful** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 Very useful** |
| The CAMPMASTER project overall | | | | | |
| The discussion during the workshops and meetings | | | | | |
| Sharing with colleagues, networking | | | | | |

| Is there anything you do want to add? (e.g. suggestions, general comments, etc.) | |
|---|---|

**Thank you!**

With the support of the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

## VIII. Quality Assurance Matrix for the learning platform

| Quality Control Check | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Generic Minimum Quality Standards** | | | | |
| **Concept** | **Dimension** | **Description** | **Rate 1-10** | **Comments** |
| Ease of use | Ease of understanding Intuitive navigation | Easy to read and understand Easy to operate and navigate | | |
| Usefulness | Information Quality Functional fit-to-task Interactivity Trust | The information provided is accurate, current and relevant Meets tasks needs and improves performance Secure communication (if any) and observance of information privacy | | |
| Entertainment | Visual appeal Innovativeness Flow | The aesthetic of the platform Creativity of the design Emotional effect using the website | | |
| Complementary relationship | Consistent image | The web graphics are consistent with the project corporate image | | |
| **Suggestions for improvement** | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **Checklist filled in by:** Name: Role: Date: Signature: | | | | |